



State of Utah
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor

Robert L. Morgan
Executive Director

Lowell P. Braxton
Division Director

1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210
PO Box 145801
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801
(801) 538-5340 telephone
(801) 359-3940 fax
(801) 538-7223 TTY
www.nr.utah.gov

November 1, 2002

TO: Minerals File

FROM: Paul Baker, Senior Reclamation Biologist *PAB*

RE: Site Inspection, Ziegler Chemical and Mineral Corporation, Ziegler Mine, M/047/013, Uintah County, Utah

Date of Inspection: October 9, 2002
Time of Inspection: 8:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.
Conditions: Clear, 60's
Participants: Stan Wagner, Ziegler; Doug Jensen and Paul Baker, DOGM

Purpose of Inspection:

On August 30, 2002, the Division received a request from Stan Wagner for a final reclamation inspection for the Cottonwood 1, 2, and 3 and Little Emma 7 properties.

Observations:

All of these sites are well graded to blend into surrounding terrain, and there were no visible hazards, such as open trenches or shafts. Vegetation at the sites was dominated by downy brome and kochia with some bee plant (*Cleome* sp.) and halogeton. Only the Cottonwood #3 site had some perennial species, including snakeweed, shadscale, and crested wheatgrass (Photo 1), but most of this site was dominated by introduced annuals (Photo 2). The Cottonwood #1 and 2 and Little Emma #7 sites are shown in Photos 3 and 4.

In addition to the sites where Ziegler had requested release, we visited the Little Emma 2 and Sterling 1 sites. The operator is in the process of reclaiming Little Emma 2. Part of the cap was built, and there was a form for the portion that still needed to be poured (Photo 5).

The Sterling #1 consisted of not much more than a hole in the ground about three feet deep (Photo 6).

Conclusions and Recommendations:

The sites for which the operator has requested release do not meet the vegetation criteria for release, but they do meet other success standards. It is doubtful whether these sites were ever seeded.

Page 2

Ziegler Chemical and Mineral, Ziegler Gilsonite Mine

M/047/013

November 1, 2002

The operator needs to scarify the surface parallel to the contour and seed them this fall. If the surface is not deeply scarified, seed could be broadcast first, but if the operator rips or deep gouges first, the seed should be broadcast after the surface treatment. It is likely the soil in these areas has a good bank of weed seeds, so revegetation with desirable species will be more difficult than it would have been if weeds had not been allowed to become established.

The Bureau of Land Management has recently expressed concern about whether the concrete caps contain reinforcing steel. One of their inspection reports documents a site where no reinforcement was used. Mr. Wagner would like to be able to show that the caps have been reinforced, and we discussed a few ways of doing this. It would be possible to leave portions of the steel exposed, but this would cause the steel and concrete to deteriorate more quickly. What appears to be the best solution is to simply document the construction of each cap and to keep good records with photographs showing the steel before the concrete is poured.

jb

cc: Stan Wagner, Ziegler
Pete Sokolosky, Vernal BLM
Will Stokes, SITLA

O:\M047-Uintah\M0470013-Ziegler\final\ins100902.doc

ATTACHMENT
Photographs
M/047/013, Ziegler Gilsonite Mine, Ziegler Chemical and Mineral



Photo 1. Cottonwood #3. This is an area with some perennial vegetation.



Photo 2. Cottonwood #3. The reclaimed area is the grayish area running just below the center of the picture.



Photo 3. Cottonwood #1 and 2.



Photo 4. Little Emma 7. Vegetation in the disturbed area is mostly halogeton, cheatgrass, bee plant, and kochia.



Photo 5. Little Emma #2.



Photo 6. Sterling #1.